

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application N .</b> 09/257,272	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HU ET AL.	
	<b>Examin r</b> Robert Landsman	<b>Art Unit</b> 1647	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Robert Landsman. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) Melissa Pytel. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 September 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, regarding "% identity" language and "mature" were discussed. Regarding the "% identity" language, Applicants suggested amending the claims to include the functional limitations "endothelial cell proliferation." This appears to overcome the issues under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, regarding "% identity" language. As for the term "mature" Applicants' arguments have overcome the enablement rejection. However, the rejection of "mature" under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, regarding written description is being maintained. Applicants are further informed that Terminal Disclaimers may need to be filed in order to prevent any potential double patenting rejections.